



Translation of Office Action dated June 24, 2005

The examination is based on the following **application documents**:

**Specification, pages**

1 through 8                      original version

**Claims, number**

1 through 17                      original version

**Drawings, sheets**

1/2 through 2/2                      original version

1. The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 52(1) EPC, since the subject matter of claims 1 and 12 is not new in the meaning of Article 54(1) and (2) EPC.

1.1 Document **WO8904727 A** (D1) discloses a device for applying glue to a moving web, comprising a contact glue nozzle coupled to a glue-filled reservoir, whereby the glue is supplied by means of conveyor means from the reservoir to the contact glue nozzle and guided out of this nozzle in the region of an outlet opening and applied to the web moving past the contact glue nozzle. Furthermore, a feeding system for feeding a substance suitable for liquefying the glue is arranged in the region of the outlet opening such that the substance can be fed in the transport direction of the moving web directly behind the contact glue nozzle (see in particular Figs. 16 and 23).

It thus follows that all characteristics of the device according to the wording of claim 1 are known from document D1. Therefore, the requirements of Articles 52 and 54 EPC are not met.

1.2 The use of the device disclosed in D1 corresponds to the procedural steps according to claim 12. Accordingly, this claim is not new either with respect to D1.

2. Dependent claims 2 through 11 and 13 through 17 do not seem to contain any further characteristics that could make a decisive contribution to inventive activity in combination with the claims to which they refer. The listed characteristics are either known from the prior art (particularly D1) or are within the scope of what one skilled in the art customarily does on the basis of considerations familiar to him, since the advantages thus achieved can easily be predicted and since no surprising advantages or unexpected effects that could be attributed to these characteristics are documented in the present application.
3. If the applicant thinks that an individual subject matter is allowable, he should file an independent claim directed to this subject matter and composed according to Rule 29(1) EPC. The response should state, on the one hand, the difference between the subject matter of the new claim and the prior art and, on the other hand, the significance of this difference. The new independent claims should be delimited accordingly with respect to D1. The specification and the dependent claims would have to be adapted to the new independent claim. During the revision of particularly the introductory part including the presentation of the object or the advantages of the invention, particular care should be taken not to add any facts that exceed the content of the application in the originally filed version (see Article 123(2), as well as examination provisions C-VI 5.7c).